

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 238 207

EC 160 880

AUTHOR Sprague, H. Duncan
TITLE A Study of Resource Specialists Who Received Waivers
from the State Board of Education During 1981-82.
SPONS AGENCY California State Dept. of Education, Sacramento. Div.
of Special Education.
PUB DATE Jul 83
GRANT 39-3651-Y605-00-82
NOTE 72p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Disabilities; *Resource Room Programs; *State
Standards; *Teacher Certification; Teacher
Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS California

ABSTRACT

Structured interviews were conducted with 72 teachers to evaluate the policy that waived full certification requirements for resource specialists serving disabled students in California. The waiver was allowed to meet the need for resource specialists as required by the California Master Plan for Special Education. The waivers are granted on the condition that (1) resource specialists will complete the full certification requirements as soon as possible; and (2) they will be evaluated on the acceptability of their service. Sixty-one representatives of the specialist's schools were also interviewed. Four of the seven findings revealed that: only 24 percent of the elementary and 56 percent of the high school Ss had a colleague resource specialist on campus; 18 Ss had already completed certification and 34 planned to do so soon; 25 felt their experience was their strongest point; and performance ratings by colleague teachers and principals were positive. Staff development needs expressed by waived and non-waived resource specialists were not significantly different. Five recommendations are made, including continuation of granting waivers on the same basis; standardization of resource specialist training programs; and inclusion of instructional aide time as an integral part of the program. (CL)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED238207

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- ☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- ☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY
HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

L. Brinegar

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

A Study of Resource Specialists Who Received Waivers
From the State Board of Education During 1981-1982

H. Duncan Sprague, Ed.D.
Project Director

July, 1983

This study was funded through Grant No. 39-3651-Y605-00-82 from the California State Department of Education. The findings and conclusions of the study are the sole responsibility of the Project Director and do not necessarily imply the agreement or endorsement of the State Department of Education.

FOREWARD

This study was funded under a grant from the California State Department of Education for the period from July 1, 1982 to June 30, 1983. It was prompted by the concerns expressed by the members of the State Board of Education as they discussed the granting of 455 waivers to Resource Specialists, who had not completed the requirements for full certification, during the School Year 1981-82. Members of the California Legislature and of the staff of the Office of Special Education, California State Department of Education, had expressed similar concerns and had expressed the need for data to substantiate the efficacy of granting such waivers. Normally the granting of such waivers is based upon the premise that the persons receiving the credential waiver will work arduously to complete the full requirements for the credential as soon as possible. In the interim, while the persons receiving such waivers serve in the position, concern is usually present as to whether or not the person is providing the services in an acceptable and professional manner.

The Project Director wishes to express his appreciation to the more than three hundred professional educators who so graciously granted the time for interviews and the information necessary to make the project possible. I wish to express my appreciation to the members of the State Board of Education, the State Department of Education, and the staffs of the California Legislature for their assistance. I wish to express my appreciation especially to my wife, Ann, who provided assistance and support and understood the importance of the study and the need for my extensive travels in accomplishing the interviews on which this report is based.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A Study of Resource Specialists Who Received Waivers from the State Board of Education During 1981-82

Introduction

The California Education Code requires that the Resource Specialist Program be under the direction of a Resource Specialist who is a credentialed special education teacher with three or more years of teaching experience in both regular and special education teaching, and who has demonstrated the competencies for the Resource Specialist.

The Education Code also required all public education agencies in California to become part of the Master Plan for Special Education by June 30, 1982; a large number of districts were entering into the Master Plan during school year 1981-82. One of the requirements of the Master Plan is the Resource Specialist Program. Many of the school districts and county offices found it impossible to hire fully certified Resource Specialists and applied to the State Board for a waiver of such requirements. During that school year the State Board approved waivers for 455 Resource Specialists.

During the discussion of such waiver requests, the members of the State Board expressed concerns including: Are the waived Resource Specialists perceived by their professional colleagues as able to provide the services defined for the program? Are the waived Resource Specialists making a sincere effort to become fully certified? And how soon will they become certified?

The purpose of the study was to collect data to answer the Board's concerns by: surveying a sample of those Resource Specialists who had received such waivers; conducting structured interviews with the Resource Specialists chosen from the population as the sample; and conducting interviews with their principals, colleague teachers with pupils in the Resource Specialist's program, and a Resource Specialist in the same facility who was fully certified.

The major issues addressed in the study are:

1. Are Resource Specialists who received waivers trying to

become certified as quickly as possible?

2. Are Resource Specialists serving under waivers perceived by their principal and colleagues as providing the services and fulfilling the position's responsibilities in an appropriate manner?
3. Are the educational components of the Resource Specialist Program at each school perceived in a similar manner by all those persons interviewed at that facility? Do those components described by the interviewees reflect the requirements of the Resource Specialist's Program prescribed in the California Education Code?
4. Do the staff development/in-service needs expressed by the Resource Specialists who received waivers in 1981-82 and those Resource Specialists who were fully certified in 1981-82 differ significantly?

Methods of the Study

This study was conducted using structured interview guides to interview a sample of the waived Resource Specialists, building principal, colleague teachers who have students in the Resource Specialist's Program, and a fully certified Resource Specialist on the same site, if one was present.

The sample was selected by placing the Resource Specialists who received waivers in 1981-82 in stratified cells by: dividing the State into North and South at the Tehachapi Mountains; dividing the sample into elementary and high school populations using the waiver applications; and by dividing the sample by district's enrollment.

The total sample size chosen was seventy-two (72), about fifteen percent of the total population. Letters requesting cooperation in the study were sent to the superintendents of schools and a sample of sixty-one (61), about thirteen percent of the population was interviewed.

The structured interview guides were given a trial using three Resource Specialists who received waivers in 1981-82, but who were not part of the sample chosen.

The interviews were conducted between November, 1982 and April, 1983 in the districts. Geographically, the sample covered the state from the north-

ern border to the southern border, from high in the Sierra to the Pacific Ocean.

The interviews were all conducted by the Project Director who traveled nearly 5,000 miles to conduct them. In order to overcome any possible incidence of biased sampling, the Project Director scheduled time for informal interviews at a majority of the schools. Such information in all cases reinforced the structured interviews.

The Findings

1. Only 24% of the elementary subjects interviewed and 56% of the high school subjects had a colleague Resource Specialist on campus. The larger the district, the more chance of more than one Resource Specialist on campus.

2. The caseload of the interviewed Resource Specialists ranged from 11 to 39 for elementary and 18 to 30 for high school. The mean caseload for elementary was 27 with a standard deviation of 4.2, while the high school subjects had the same mean, 27, with a standard deviation of 1.2. The largest deviation in caseload was in the smaller elementary districts in the North, and the smallest deviation was for high schools in the North. The majority of the study had a caseload of 28, the limit allowed by law.

3. Eighteen (18) of the subjects had already completed their certification at the time of the interview and thirty-four (34) will do so during this school year. At the end of the 1982-83 school year, eighty-five percent (85%) will have completed their certification and will no longer need a waiver.

4. Thirty-seven (37) of the Resource Specialists interviewed were employed from within the district. Seventy-five percent (75%) lacked a clear special education credential at the time they were selected.

5. Of the subjects who lacked a clear credential, twenty-six lived within twenty-five (25) miles of an institution of higher education offering a resource specialist training program. By report, however, many of those had instituted the program after the subject was granted a waiver. Thirty-one (31) of those interviewed volunteered that the most valuable instruction they had received was from their county office of education or SELPA in-service program.

6. In response to the question, "What do you consider the strong points you have brought to your role as a Resource Specialist?" twenty-five (40%) responded that their experience was the strongest point. Twenty-four (39%) felt their ability to relate well to children rated first.

To a question regarding the strongest point the Resource Specialist has displayed, both elementary and high school principals responded, "Intense interest in children."

7. When the colleague teachers were asked to assess the performance of the waived Resource Specialist, eighty-five percent (85%) of the high school and ninety-two percent (92%) of the elementary teachers responded with nothing but praise for their colleague. No teacher rated their colleague, "poor."

Summary

The typical Resource Specialist serving under waiver, as sampled by this study, is an Elementary Resource Specialist serving alone in an elementary school. She was serving in another instructional position when she applied for the job. She needed a waiver since she did not have a clear special education credential. She feels her strongest attribute for the program is her ability to relate to children. An over-abundance of paperwork is the weakest point in her program. She works longer hours, by her principal's report, than the average faculty member. Her program is designed for her to work with students on a "pull-out" basis for one to two hours per pupil per day. She also assists the teachers where her charges are integrated into the regular program. One of her frustrations is the lack of time and opportunity to consult more with the teachers in the school.

The typical High School Resource Specialist under waiver, in this sample, is male. He works with students in an innovative classroom with one aide. He focuses on reinforcing students on the materials they are studying in other classes. He is including vocational and career materials in his instruction. One of his major frustrations is, "You can't teach them if they aren't here." A majority of his students have never had success in school and he must overcome that reluctance to be where one has not succeeded. The teachers he works closely with understand what he is trying to do. There are still some teachers who do not understand, but feel his program is primarily for misbehaving students. He has completed his certification requirements this year. He is active in extra-curricular activities, probably coaches or helps coach a sport. He feels his strongest attribute is his variety of experience and the weakness in the program is lack of time.

Conclusions

1. Since the majority of the waived Resource Specialists interviewed (85.2%) will have completed their requirements by the end of this school year, the first question is answered in the affirmative.

2. According to the report of 70% of the Principals interviewed, the subjects have no weak points in their role as Resource Specialist. The subjects' colleagues overwhelmingly assess them as working out well in their role. One principal described the type it takes to be a good Resource Specialist as, "A 'B' type personality with 'A' type priorities."

3. The components of the program were perceived in a similar manner by those persons interviewed.

4. Staff development needs expressed by waived and non-waived Resource Specialists did not significantly differ.

Recommendations

1. That the State Board of Education continue to grant waivers for Resource Specialists on the same basis as presently. The importance of "having the right type person to relate to our type of students" was a consistent item of discussion by principals and teacher colleagues.

2. That the State Colleges revise their Resource Specialist Training curricula to standardize it on a state-wide basis. A part of the change should be the opportunity for graduate students to transfer between campuses without loss of credit.

3. That those professionals with one teaching credential be allowed to complete the requirements for the Resource Specialist without the necessity of taking CBEST.

4. That fully qualified professionally trained special educators who matriculated and taught in other states be able to achieve California credentials without retaking all of the college courses they presently are required to retake.

5. That state planners and decision makers understand that instructional aide time is as integral a part of the program as are special materials. In the Resource Specialist Programs covered by this study, there does not seem to be enough of either ingredient of the program.

III. TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. FOREWARD.....	i
II. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	ii
III. TABLE OF CONTENTS	
IV. LIST OF TABLES.....	vii
<u>Chapter</u>	
1. Introduction.....	1
2. Methods of Study.....	3
2.1 Data Gathering Procedures.....	3
2.2 The Population of Waivered Resource Specialists.....	3
2.3 The Sample.....	4
2.4 The Interview Instrument.....	6
2.5 The Interviews.....	6
3. Findings.....	8
3.1 General.....	8
3.2 Colleague Resource Specialists.....	8
3.3 Waived Resource Specialists.....	8
3.31 Program Load.....	8
3.32 Certification.....	10
3.33 Source of Application.....	10
3.34 Distance to Training Institution.....	12
3.35 "Strong Points".....	13
3.36 "Weakest Point".....	14
3.4 Colleague Teacher Responses.....	14
3.5 Suggestions for Preparation.....	15
3.6 Suggestions for Role Change.....	15
3.7 Components of the Resource Specialist Program.....	16
3.8 Staff Development Needs.....	16
4. Summary.....	18
5. Conclusions.....	20
6. Recommendations.....	22

V. APPENDIX

TABLE I. The Total Population.....	23
TABLE II. The Original Sample.....	24
TABLE III. The Final Sample.....	25
TABLE IV. Characteristics of the Subjects.....	26
A. Caseload.....	26
B. Resource Specialist's Projected Completion Date.....	27
C. Application Source for Subjects.....	28
D. Reason for Waiver.....	30
E. Completion Date by Waiver Need.....	32
F. Distance from University or State College Offering Program.....	33
TABLE V. Self Report of Resource Specialists.....	34
A. "Strong Points".....	34
B. "Weakest Point in Role".....	35
C. Suggestions for Preparation or Type.....	36
TABLE VI. Report of the Principals.....	37
A. "Subject's Strong Points".....	37
B. "Subject's Weakest Point".....	39
C. Suggestions for Preparation or Type.....	40
TABLE VII. Report of the Colleague Teachers.....	42
A. Role evaluation.....	42
B. "How has subject worked with you".....	43
C. "In what ways could subject have helped you".....	44
D. Suggestions for improved assistance.....	45
E. Suggestions for Preparation or Type.....	46
TABLE VIII. Non-waivered and Waivered Resource Specialists.....	47
A. Comparison of highest priority staff development.....	47
INTERVIEW GUIDES.....	48
A. Waivered Resource Specialist.....	48
B. Principal.....	52
C. Colleague Teacher.....	56
D. Non-waivered Resource Specialist.....	59

IV. List of Tables

	Page
Table A - Original Sample of Waivered Resource Specialists for this Study.....	4
Table B - Actual Sample of Waivered Resource Specialists Interviewed for the Study.....	6
Table C - Program Load by Geographical Region and ADA.....	9
Table D - Application Source for Subjects of the Study.....	11
Table E - Reasons for Waivers by Application Source.....	12

A STUDY OF RESOURCE SPECIALISTS WHO RECEIVED WAIVERS FROM THE
STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION DURING 1981-82

1. INTRODUCTION

Section 56362(b) of the California Education Code states:

The resource specialist program shall be under the direction of a resource specialist who is a credentialed special education teacher, or who has a clinical services credential with a special class authorization, who has had three or more years of teaching experience, including both regular and special teaching experience, as defined by rules and regulations of the Commission for Teacher Preparation and Licensing, and who has demonstrated the competencies for a resource specialist, as established by the Commission for Teacher Preparation and Licensing.

Section 56101 of the California Education Code authorizes the State Board of Education to grant waivers from these regulations,

when the facts indicate that failure to do so would hinder implementation of the pupil's individualized education program or compliance by a district, special education services region, or county office with federal mandates for a free, appropriate education for handicapped children.

The State Board of Education, during the school year 1981-82, granted 455 waivers for resource specialists in California, who had not met the certification requirements cited above. The Board granted these waivers under criteria adopted by the Board. In order for the resource specialist to receive a waiver, the public education agency must submit an application which includes a description of the efforts the agency has made to employ a fully qualified Resource Specialist and the qualifications of the candidate for the waiver. The Board determines whether or not to grant the waiver on the basis of the efforts of the agency and the qualifications of the candidate. When the waiver is granted it is assumed by the Board that the person receiving the waiver will endeavor to become fully qualified as soon as possible.

The State Board of Education in their waiver discussions expressed the perception that this number (455) was a substantial increase over the previous year, since 1981-82 was the mandatory school year for all public educational agencies to become part of the California Master Plan for Special Education.

In the discussions which preceded the granting of the waivers for Resource Specialist, the State Board members expressed concerns regarding: the numbers of waivers; if the waived Resource Specialists were perceived by their professional colleagues as able to provide the services defined for the program; if the waived Resource Specialists would make the effort to become fully qualified; and how soon they would become fully qualified. The Project Director interviewed several members of the Board to ascertain that these were the concerns of the Board relating to the granting of waivers to Resource Specialists.

The purpose of the study was to collect data to answer the Board's concerns by: surveying a sample of those Resource Specialists who had received such waivers; conducting structured interviews with this sample of Resource Specialists; and conducting structured interviews with their principal, colleague teachers with pupils in the Resource Specialist's program, and a Resource Specialist in the same facility who was fully qualified.

The following major issues have been addressed in the study:

1. Are Resource Specialists who received waivers trying to become fully certified as quickly as possible?
2. Are Resource Specialists serving under waivers perceived by their principal and their colleagues as providing the services and fulfilling the position's responsibilities in an appropriate manner?
3. Are the educational components of the Resource Specialist Program at each school perceived in a similar manner by all those persons interviewed at that facility? Do those components described by the interviewees reflect the requirements of the Resource Specialist's Program prescribed in the California Education Code?
4. Do the staff development/in-service needs expressed by the Resource Specialists who received waivers in 1981-82 and those Resource Specialists who were fully certified in 1981-82 differ significantly?

2. METHODS OF THE STUDY

The study was done by a survey using structured interviews with the Resource Specialist who had received a waiver in 1981-82, the Principal, the Teacher Colleagues who had pupils in the Resource Specialist's program, and a Resource Specialist on the same campus who was fully certified.

2.1 Data Gathering Procedures.

To gather the data necessary to answer the questions posed as the major issues of the study, a survey was conducted using structured interview guides to interview the building principal, the Resource Specialist who received the waiver in 1981-82, colleague teachers who have students in the Resource Specialist's program, and a Resource Specialist on the same site who was fully certified, if one was present.

The questions asked in the structured interview guides were designed to gather parallel data from the Resource Specialist who had received the waiver, the principal and the teacher colleagues regarding the manner in which the waived Resource Specialist was providing the services and instruction of their program.

The principal and Resource Specialist were questioned regarding the location of the nearest institution of higher education providing a program leading to the certification needed by the Resource Specialist. The State Board members had expressed belief that more waivers were given to Resource Specialist who taught in school districts at considerable distance from such an institution.

All of those interviewed were asked to describe the Resource Specialist program at their school. If there were major differences expressed by persons interviewed at the same school, the responses given to questions concerning the provision of such services could be affected.

2.2 The Population of Waivered Resource Specialists.

The approved waiver applications for the school year 1981-82 were examined and the applicants placed in stratified statistical cells in the following manner:

The State was divided into North and South using the Tehachapi Mountains as the geographical boundary. Then using the information contained in the

applications for waivers submitted by the districts or county offices to the State Board of Education, an attempt was made to divide the population into elementary and high school resource specialist populations. The population was then classified by District Average Daily Attendance (ADA), as reported for the previous year to the State Department of Education. [School Districts report their official attendance figures to the Department for the purposes of qualifying for state reimbursement. These official figures were used to segregate school districts by size for the study.] [See Appendix, Table I]

2.3 The Sample

The Waivered Resource Specialists were placed into stratified cells based on geography [North and South], education level [Elementary and High School] and the ADA of the school district. Fifteen percent of the waivered Resource Specialists (N=72) were selected at random to constitute the sample for this study. The sample size was decided as a compromise between the costs involved in a larger sample size and the amount of error associated with a smaller sample size.

TABLE A

Original Sample of Waivered Resource Specialists for this Study

<u>ADA</u>	<u>Elementary</u>		<u>High School</u>		<u>Total</u>
	<u>North</u>	<u>South</u>	<u>North</u>	<u>South</u>	
0 - 999	3 (4%)	1 (1%)	1 (1%)	0	5 (7%)
1,000-19,999	23 (32%)	16 (22%)	2 (3%)	5 (7%)	46 (64%)
20,000-29,000	3 (4%)	12 (17%)	3 (4%)	0	18 (25%)
30,000+	0	3 (4%)	0	0	3 (4%)
Total	29 (40%)	32 (44%)	6 (9%)	5 (7%)	72 (100%)

In order to arrive at the final sample for the study, the Project Director contacted districts representing seventy-two (72) Waivered Resource Specialists. The original mailing elicited sixteen (16) responses which disqualified individuals from the sample. Seven (7) Resource Specialists had left the district; one superintendent, whose district contained two (2) members of the proposed sample, chose not to participate; six (6) Resource Specialists had chosen to return to teaching special day classes; and one (1) Resource Specialist had been subject to a reduction in force. An additional random sample was selected to replace these subjects.

During the course of the study, five (5) more subjects were lost to the study: one Resource Specialist refused to participate on the basis that the interviews involved peer evaluation; two (2) were subject to reduction in force; one superintendent decided not to participate; and one Resource Specialist became ill.

The potential subjects lost prior to the study came in greater proportions from districts over 20,000 ADA. The two district superintendents who chose not to participate were from districts with between 1,000 and 19,999 ADA. The three Resource Specialists who were subject to reduction in force came from districts of 1,000 to 19,999 ADA.

The Superintendent of Schools of the public educational agency which employed the selected Resource Specialist was contacted and asked to cooperate in the study and to designate a contact person for the study. From this original mailing, answers were received which disqualified 16 Resource Specialists from the study.

The Project Director telephoned the contact person designated by the Superintendent of the public educational agency to set schedules for the interviews. Interviews were conducted with the Principal, the Waivered Resource Specialist, three Colleague Teachers who had pupils in the Waivered Resource Specialist's program, and with a fully certified Resource Specialist in the same building, if there was one.

TABLE B

Actual Sample of Waivered Resource Specialists Interviewed for the Study

<u>ADA</u>	<u>Elementary</u>		<u>High School</u>		<u>Total</u>
	<u>North</u>	<u>South</u>	<u>North</u>	<u>South</u>	
0-999	4 (7%)	0	1 (2%)	1 (2%)	6 (9%)
1,000-19,999	15 (25%)	15 (25%)	3 (5%)	5 (8%)	38 (63%)
20,000-29,999	0	9 (15%)	6 (10%)	0	15 (25%)
30,000+	0	2 (3%)	0	0	2 (3%)
Total	19 (31%)	26 (43%)	10 (16%)	6 (10%)	61 (100%)

Percentage of total population = 13.4%

Percentage of those originally contacted = 84.7%

The participants in the study have been designated Waivered Resource Specialist, Principal, Colleague Teacher, and Non-waivered Resource Specialist. The "Waivered Resource Specialist" is a person serving in the Resource Specialist's position under a waiver from the State Board of Education. This waiver was requested by the district since the person lacked a clear special education credential, teaching experience in both regular and special classes, or other competencies required for certification. The "Principal" is the building principal of the school in which the Waivered Resource Specialist serves. The "Colleague Teacher" is a regular classroom teacher who has pupils in his/her class who spend part of their day in the Waivered Resource Specialist's program. The "Non-waivered Resource Specialist" is a Resource Specialist serving in the same building as the Waivered Resource Specialist, who is fully certified and not serving under a waiver from the State Board of Education.

2.4 The Interview Instrument

The subjects were personally interviewed using a structured interview

guide, developed after analyzing discussions by the Board, interviews with members of the State Board of Education and staff members of the Office of Special Education, State Department of Education. The questions were developed to elicit answers to the questions which had been posed by Board members, and State Department Staff members. The study was also discussed with members of the staff of legislative education committees and with two members of the California Legislature.

Four different instruments for the structured interviews were developed for the following groups of participants in the study. [The instruments are included in the Appendices A, B, C, and D]

1. The Waivered Resource Specialist;
2. The Principal;
3. The Colleague Teacher; and
4. The Non-waivered Resource Specialist.

To pilot the instrument the Project Director selected three Resource Specialists who had received waivers in school year 1981-82 who were not part of the actual sample chosen for the study. Permission was obtained from the Superintendent of Schools of the three districts as well as cooperation of the Principals, Resource Specialists and colleague teachers for interviews. This group was used to test and revise the questions developed for the structured interview guide.

2.5 The Interviews

The first interview was conducted on November 8, 1982, and the final interview was conducted on April 11, 1983. In all case, the persons to be interviewed were given assurances that their identity would be kept confidential.

The time required for the interviews ranged from twenty-five minutes per interview to two hours for some interviews. The structured interviews were conducted with personnel selected by the principal of the school. In order to overcome any possible incidence of biased sampling, the interviewer scheduled sufficient time at many of the schools for informal interviews with school personnel who had not be selected by the principal. The information elicited from such informal interviews reinforced the structured interviews in all cases.

3. FINDINGS

3.1 General

In any research project involving interviews, the interviewer comes away with more than statistical data. The general impression of the Resource Specialists interviewed, although perhaps subjective on the part of the Project Director, was that they were above average in intelligence, in energy devoted to the program, in dedication to the students and in the program and general appearance. This impression was reinforced by the reports of the Principals and Colleagues interviewed.

3.2 Colleague Resource Specialists

Only 24 percent of the elementary Resource Specialists interviewed had another Resource Specialist on the same campus, while 56 percent of the high school Resource Specialists had a colleague Resource Specialist. The elementary Resource Specialists were in a more independent situation, while the High School Resource Specialist was a member of a Resource Specialist staff. In five of the nine high schools where the Waivered Resource Specialist was part of a Resource Specialist staff, they had been chosen to serve as the head of the Resource Specialist staff on that campus.

No Resource Specialist in districts under 1,000 ADA had a colleague Resource Specialist on campus. The larger the ADA of the district, the greater the possibility that the elementary and high school Resource Specialist had another Resource Specialist on campus.

3.3 Waivered Resource Specialists

3.31 Program Load

The program load of the elementary subjects ranged from 11 to 39, while the program load for the high school subjects ranged from 18 to 30. The mean load for the elementary subjects was 27 with a standard deviation of 4.2, while the high school subjects had the same mean load of 27, and the standard deviation was 1.2. [See Appendix, Table IV A]

TABLE C

Program Load by Geographical Region and ADA

SOUTH

Elementary	<u>ADA</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Range</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>
	0 - 999	0	-	-	-
	1,000-29,999	24	17 to 28	26	3.1
	30,000+	2	21 to 24	23	2.0
High School					
	0 -999	1	28	28	0
	1,000-29,999	4*	18-28	26	5.0
	30,000+	0	-	-	-

* One Resource Specialist was half-time with a load of 14.

NORTH

Elementary	<u>ADA</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Range</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>
	0-999	4	11-32	25	8.1
	1,000-29,999	15	21-39	28	2.7
	30,000+	0	-	-	-
High School					
	0-999	1	28	28	0
	1,000-29,999	9	27-30	28	.7
	30,000+	0	-	-	-

The largest deviation in program load was in the smaller elementary districts in the North. The smallest deviation, aside from those small high school districts with only one in the category, was in the high schools in the North. The majority of the subjects of the study did have a caseload of twenty-eight (28), the limit allowed by law.

3.32 Certification

Eighteen (18) of the subjects (29.5%) had already completed the full Resource Specialist Certification prior to the interview. An additional thirty-four (34) or (55.7%) will do so during this school year. By the end of school year 1982-83, eighty-five point two percent (85.2%) will have completed their requirements and will no longer need a waiver. An additional three (3) plan to complete their requirements by the end of school year 1983-84, and two (2) more plan to complete in 1985. Only four (4) of the subjects, comprising seven percent (7%) of the sample do not plan to complete their requirements. Three plan to retire shortly, and one refuses to take the California Basic Education Skills Test and will go back to classroom teaching. [See Appendix, Table IV B]

Of those subjects who had already completed their requirements in 1982, seven were from elementary schools in the South and seven from elementary schools in the North. No High School subjects from the South had completed their requirements, while four High School subjects from the North had. In 1983 an additional 14 from elementary schools in the South will complete their requirements and eleven from elementary schools in the North. In 1983 the first five high school subjects in the South will complete, and an additional four high school subjects from the North will complete their certification requirements.

Twenty-four (24) of the subjects reported that they had used the classes they were taking at an institution of higher education as a vehicle to report difficulties they were having in their program and to receive information and advice for solving such difficulties. They reported that they found such experience valuable and would not have had the opportunity for such assistance if they had already completed their course-work prior to beginning work as a Resource Specialist.

3.33 Source of Application

Of the subject Resource Specialists who received waivers from the State Board in School Year 1981-82, thirty-seven (37), sixty-one percent, were selected from within the district. Of these chosen from within the district, twenty-eight or three-fourths, lacked a clear special education credential.

Twenty-four applied from outside the district; thirteen lacked a clear special education credential and eleven lacked experience. Of the thirteen from outside the district who lacked a clear special education credential, four had Master's degrees and a full special education credential from other states, but since California does not have a reciprocity agreement with these states, they are required to take the California credential requirements while serving under a waiver. In every case they were evaluated by their principal and peers as exceptional resource specialists. [In Appendix, Table IV C & D]

TABLE D

Application Source for Subjects of the Study

From within the district

	<u>South</u>	<u>North</u>	<u>Total</u>
Elementary	17	9	26
High School	4	7	11
Total	21	16	37

From outside the district

	<u>South</u>	<u>North</u>	<u>Total</u>
Elementary	9	10	19
High School	2	3	5
Total	11	13	24

The reasons given for the need for the waivers by application source are presented in Table E.

TABLE E

Reasons for Waivers by Application Source

<u>Reason for the waiver</u>	<u>Applied from within the District</u>		<u>Applied from outside the District</u>	
	<u>Elem.</u>	<u>High School</u>	<u>Elem.</u>	<u>High School</u>
Lacked three years of experience	6	1	6	3
Lacked clear credential	19	9	12	1
Lacked experience in both regular and special education	1	0	1	1
Lacked other Resource Specialist courses	0	1	0	0
Total	26	11	19	5

The largest category of subjects applied from within the district and lacked a clear special education credential. Of this group, the majority, twenty-three (23), were in elementary districts with between 1,000 and 19,999 ADA. [See Appendix, Table IV D]

3.34 Distance to Training Institution

Since the members of the State Board of Education had suggested that the reason for waiver applications could well be the distance from an institution of higher education offering the Resource Specialist training, a question was asked of the sample regarding the distance to such an institution. Of the Resource Specialists who received a waiver because they lacked a clear

special education credential, twenty-six (43%) lived within twenty-five miles of an institution which has a resource specialist training program. Four Resource Specialists (6%) lived between 25 and 50 miles of such an institution, four (6%) lived between 50 and 75 miles, and seven (11%) lived over 75 miles of such an institution. [See Appendix, Table IV F]

Of the subjects who lacked a clear credential, fourteen (14) or (23%), did respond that although the nearest institution of higher education did presently have such a program, the program was not instituted until after the waiver, so they had taken their course-work at more distant institutions.

Several of the Waivered Resource Specialists commented about the State Colleges and the State College's Resource Specialist Training Programs. They related that there was no consistency to the requirements of the college, with rare exceptions. Several had tried to transfer from one state college to another and had been informed that they would be required to take courses over, or would be required to take additional courses to meet the requirements of that college. They also reported that one state college requires a candidate for Resource Specialist to be in residence for an entire year. The subjects felt that this was an extreme requirement, especially when the position of Resource Specialist does not include additional salary above the teaching salary. They also commented that they wondered why the Resource Specialist, who receives no added compensation, was required to obtain a special credential when other special educators were not when their district became part of the Master Plan for Special Education, i.e., the Program Specialist receives additional compensation, but is not required to obtain a special credential as Program Specialist.

Thirty-one (31) or (51%) of those interviewed volunteered that the most valuable instruction they had received was from their county office of education or Special Education Local Plan Area in-service program.

3.35 "Strong Points"

Of the responses given to the question, "What do you consider the strong points you have brought to your role as a Resource Specialist?" twenty (33%) responded that their strongest point was "their experience." Twenty-nine (48%) felt that their strongest point was their ability to relate well to

children. The first response of nine (14%) was that they were well organized, while relating well to teachers and parents was reported by two (3%), and one (2%) felt his experience in vocational education was the strongest point. [See Appendix, Table V]

In response to the question regarding the strongest point the subject has displayed as a Resource Specialist, the Elementary Principals reported, "Intense interest in children," as the first choice answer as did the High School Principals. Of the other responses, only two Elementary and two High School Principals responded with items relating to training. The rest of the responses related to personality traits. [See Appendix, Table VI A]

The majority of Principals (64%) in all sizes of school districts and in both elementary and high school agreed that, "Intense interest in children," was the strongest point the subjects had displayed in their roles as Resource Specialists.

3.36 "Weakest Point"

To the question what they considered their weakest point in their role as a Resource Specialist, as their first choice answer, the most frequent responses by the Resource Specialists were, "Not enough time," (30%) and "Too much paperwork," (16%). [See Appendix, Table V B]

Seventy percent of the Principals responded to the same question regarding the subjects with, "None." The next most popular response which was given related to the propensity of the Resource Specialists to try to do too much! [See Appendix, Table VI B]

3.4 Colleague Teacher Responses

When the 183 Colleague Teachers were asked to assess the performance of the Waivered Resource Specialist, eighty-five percent (85%) of the High School Teachers and ninety-two percent (92%) of the Elementary School Teachers had nothing but praise for their colleague. No teacher rated their colleague, "Poor," and only two Elementary Teachers felt that the Waivered Resource Specialist, "Could be better." [See Appendix, Table VII A]

In assessing how the subject had worked with them regarding integrated children, ninety percent (90%) of the High School Teachers and ninety-three percent (93%) of the Elementary Teachers volunteered that the Resource Specialist had worked closely with them. [See Appendix, Table VII B]

The Colleague Teachers were asked, "In what ways could the subject have assisted you, but was unable to?" Seventy-nine percent (79%) of the High School Teachers and fifty-nine percent (59%) of the Elementary Teachers responded, "None." [See Appendix, Table VII C]

The size of district and elementary or high school level did not vary the above responses.

3.5 Suggestions for Preparation

The interviewees responded to the question, "What preparation or type of person does it take to be a good Resource Specialist in your district?" Of the first choice answers, forty-two percent (42%) of the Elementary Resource Specialists responded, "Regular class experience," as their first choice. In contrast, not one gave, "Special class experience" as their first response. Fifty percent (50%) of the High School Resource Specialists responded in the same manner. Again, no first responses mentioned, "Special class experience." [See Appendix, Table V C]

The number one response to the same question by the Elementary Principals was, "Gets along with children well," (33%). The High School Principals had a three way tie in their first response: "Taught regular class;" "Gets along with children well;" and "Has special skills;" each received twenty-five percent (25%) of the High School Principal responses. [See Appendix, Table VI C]

In response to a similar question, forty-eight percent (48%) of the High School Teachers responded that, "Good at getting along with children," was the top priority. The Elementary Teachers responded in the same manner, forty-one percent (41%). [See Appendix, Table VII E]

3.6 Suggestions for Role Change

The Colleague Teachers were also asked, "Do you have any suggestion about how the Resource Specialist's role could be changed to assist the regular classroom teacher more?" Forty-eight percent (48%) of the High School Teachers and fifty-nine percent (59%) of the Elementary teachers responded, "No." Both groups second highest placed response was, "More time to discuss children and problems," - High School Teachers, thirty-five percent (35%) and Elementary Teachers, twenty-three percent (23%).

3.7 Components of the Resource Specialist Program

All persons interviewed were asked to describe the Resource Specialist Program at their school. The interview reliability was positive in that all persons interviewed at each school described the same program. Between schools the description of the program varied, but in all cases the description contained all of the requirements of law. Some schools had a more sophisticated program of career and vocational development than others, but all schools had some program as prescribed in the Education Code as amended last year. These components from the Education Code include: (1) Pupil is assigned to the regular classroom for the majority of the school day; (2) Provision of information and assistance to the individual with exceptional needs and their parents; (3) Provision of consultation, resource information, and material regarding the individual with exceptional needs to their parents and to regular staff members; (4) Coordination of special education services with the regular school program for each individual with exceptional needs in the resource specialist program; (5) Monitoring of pupil progress on a regular basis, participation in the review and revision of the Individualized Education Programs as appropriate, and referral of pupils who do not demonstrate appropriate progress to the Individualized Education Program Team; and (6) On the secondary level, emphasis on academic achievement, career and vocational development, and preparation for adult life.

3.8 Staff Development Needs

The Waivered and Non-waivered Resource Specialists described their priorities for staff development. The first choice responses were written exactly as given. These responses were then given for validation to fully certified Resource Specialists, who were not part of the sample. As a result of these analyses, the Elementary Resource Specialists had identified eight areas and the High School Resource Specialists had identified eight areas. [See Appendix, Table VIII A]

Of the eleven Elementary Resource Specialists under waiver the first choice varied in only one case when compared with the responses of the Colleague Resource Specialists. One Waivered Resource Specialist chose, "assessment practices," when the Non-waivered chose, "career education."

In the responses given by the High School Resource Specialists, the responses differed only once when the Waivered Resource Specialist chose, "teaching strategies," when the Non-waivered Resource Specialist chose, "new laws affecting our jobs."

In their second choices, when given, the choices did not coincide as closely as the first responses. Among the staff development subjects chosen by the Resource Specialists, the most popular were: Time management; Assessment; Remediation techniques; and Teaching strategies. For a complete list see Appendix, Table VIII A.

4. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

As a result of interviewing three hundred and twenty-five (325) professional educators in fifty-nine (59) schools regarding the services provided by Resource Specialists serving under waivers from the State Board of Education during school year 1981-82, the following findings were ascertained:

- a. At the time of the interview, over a quarter of the sample (18) had already completed their certification and by the end of school year 1982-83 eighty-five percent (85%) of the sample (53) will be fully certified.
- b. The program load for the sample averaged 27 pupils, with a larger range of load among elementary Resource Specialists in the study than among the high school Resource Specialists in the sample.
- c. Most elementary Resource Specialists in the sample are the only Resource Specialist at their school site. Over half of the Resource Specialists in high schools had colleague Resource Specialists at their school.
- d. Of the sample, sixty-one percent (61%) were chosen from another position from within their present district.
- e. The major reason for the district to apply for a waiver for the individual in the sample was the lack of clear special education credential (67%).
- f. For those members of the sample who did not have a clear special education credential, thirty-four percent (34%) reported that the institution of higher education nearest to them did not institute the program for Resource Specialist training until after their district had applied for a waiver for them. This necessitated their going to a more distant institution. Of the total sample, forty-three percent (43%) lived within twenty-five (25) miles of an institution of higher education. One of the subjects commuted 120 miles each way to attend classes to complete the certification.
- g. The strongest point the majority of the members of the sample brought to their role as Resource Specialist by both self-report and report of their principals was their intense interest in children (64%).

- h. The weakest points in their role as Resource Specialists, by self-report were "Not enough time" and "Too much paperwork." The Principals who did feel the subject had a weak point reported that the Resource Specialist tried to do too much.
- i. The ratings given to the members of the sample by their Colleague teachers who had students in the Resource Specialist's program for part of the school day were extremely positive. Ninety percent (90%) of the teachers also reported that they worked closely with the subject.
- j. The most popular choice by the members of the sample regarding what type of preparation a person should have to be a good Resource Specialist was, "Regular class experience." Their Principals and their Teacher Colleagues rated, "Gets along with children well," as first priority.
- k. The colleague teachers were asked to suggest how the Resource Specialist's role could be changed to assist the regular classroom teacher more. The answer receiving the highest response was "No changes were necessary." The response placing second was, "More time to discuss children and problems."
- l. All persons interviewed were asked to describe the Resource Specialist Program at their school. Their responses described the same program, and that description demonstrated compliance with the Program's description in the Education Code.
- m. In comparing the descriptions of the first choice for inservice priorities of the Waivered Resource Specialists and the colleague Resource Specialists who were fully certified, no significant difference was found. The following areas were consistently named as areas desirable for staff development: time management; assessment; remediation techniques; teaching strategies; sharing of materials; student integration; differential proficiency standards; and vocational and career education.

5. CONCLUSIONS

1. The Study's first major issue asked, "Are Resource Specialists who received waivers trying to become fully certified as quickly as possible?"

Since the majority of the Waivered Resource Specialists interviewed (85.2%) will have completed their requirements by the end of this school year, the first question is answered in the affirmative. Eight percent (8%) of those completing their course-work are driving distances of over 100 miles one-way, because the closest State College or University did not have a program completely in operation when the average Resource Specialist applied for the position and the district applied to the State Board for the waiver. Another reason for by-passing some State Colleges or Universities, according to the interviews, is the inability to transfer between campuses of the State College system without losing credits. Many of the subjects interviewed wanted to know why there couldn't be a state-wide standardized course of study.

2. The second major issue, "Are Resource Specialists serving under waivers perceived by their principal and their colleagues as providing the services and fulfilling the position's responsibilities in an appropriate manner?"

According to the report of seventy percent (70%) of the Principals interviewed, the Resource Specialist has no weak points in his/her role as a Resource Specialist. The Resource Specialist's colleagues overwhelmingly assess the Resource Specialist as working out very well in his/her role. One principal described the type it takes to be a good Resource Specialist as, "A 'B' type personality with 'A' type priorities." The interview notes for the interviews with the Principals and Colleague Teachers are full of testimonials. In a majority of the school sites visited, the interviewer stopped in the faculty rooms or elsewhere on the campus to talk to teachers. These unscheduled interviews reinforced the information received in the interviews; the Resource Specialists in this sample are perceived by their Colleagues and Principals as performing as qualified Resource Specialists and performing a competent service to their students.

3. "Are the educational components of the Resource Specialist Program at each school perceived in a similar manner by all those persons interviewed at the facility? Do those components described by the interviewees reflect the requirements of the Resource Specialist Program prescribed in the California Education Code?"

The components of the Resource Specialist Program were perceived in a similar manner by those persons interviewed. There may be some professionals on the school's staff who do not understand the program, but they are persons not involved with the school population served by the Resource Specialists.

4. "Do the staff development/in-service needs expressed by the Resource Specialists who received waivers in 1981-82 and those Resource Specialists who were fully certified differ significantly?"

The staff development needs expressed by the Waivered Resource Specialists and their colleague Resource Specialists did not significantly differ on the first response. Apparently the Resource Specialists work together closely enough so that they discuss their staff development desires and tend to internalize and adopt from one another.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the State Board of Education continue to grant waivers for Resource Specialists who lack certain of the requirements on the same basis as presently granted. The random sample interviewed in this study certainly supports the efficacy of this practice. The importance of, "having the right person to relate to our type of students," was a consistent item of discussion regarding priorities by Principals, Teachers, and other Resource Specialists. When reference was made to Resource Specialists who had left the position, the reason most often given related to interpersonal relationship skills and not to lack of training. The position was described as a demanding one that many people were not prepared for physically and emotionally. The interviews reflected a constant plea for local determination regarding candidates for Resource Specialist positions.

2. That the State Colleges and Universities revise their Resource Specialist Training curricula to standardize it on a state-wide basis. A part of the change should be the opportunity for graduate students to transfer between campuses without loss of credit units. One Resource Specialist related that to transfer from one state college campus to another would require taking 12 more graduate units.

3. That those professionals with one teaching credential be allowed to complete the requirements for the Resource Specialist Certificate without the necessity of taking CBEST. [One piece of legislation already introduced this year includes the same proposal.]

4. That fully qualified professionally trained special educators who matriculated and taught in other states be able to achieve California credentials without retaking all of the college courses they presently are required to retake.

5. That state planners and decision makers understand that instructional aide time is as integral a part of the program as are special materials. In the Resource Specialist Programs covered by this study, there does not seem to be enough of either essential ingredient of the program.

V. APPENDIX

TABLE I

THE TOTAL POPULATION

SOUTH

<u>ADA</u>	<u>ELEMENTARY</u>	<u>HIGH SCHOOL</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
0-999	11 (2%)	1 (0%)	12 (3%)
1,000-19,999	125 (27%)	26 (6%)	151 (33%)
20,000-29,999	34 (7%)	2 (0%)	36 (7%)
30,000+	<u>20 (4%)</u>	<u>0 (0%)</u>	<u>20 (4%)</u>
Total	190 (42%)	29 (6%)	219 (48%)

NORTH

0-999	53 (12%)	7 (2%)	59 (13%)
1,000-19,999	126 (28%)	20 (4%)	146 (32%)
20,000-29,999	10 (2%)	12 (3%)	22 (5%)
30,000+	<u>9 (2%)</u>	<u>0 (0%)</u>	<u>9 (2%)</u>
Total	198 (43%)	39 (9%)	236 (52%)

TABLE II

THE ORIGINAL SAMPLE

SOUTH

<u>ADA</u>	<u>ELEMENTARY</u>	<u>HIGH SCHOOL</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
0-999	1 (1%)	0 (0%)	1 (1%)
1,000-19,999	16 (22%)	5 (7%)	21 (29%)
20,000-29,999	12 (17%)	0 (0%)	12 (17%)
30,000+	<u>3 (4%)</u>	<u>0 (0%)</u>	<u>3 (4%)</u>
Total	32 (44%)	5 (7%)	37 (51%)

NORTH

0-999	3 (4%)	1 (1%)	4 (6%)
1,000-19,999	23 (32%)	2 (3%)	25 (35%)
20,000-29,999	3 (4%)	3 (4%)	6 (8%)
30,000+	<u>0 (0%)</u>	<u>0 (0%)</u>	<u>0 (0%)</u>
Total	29 (40%)	6 (8%)	35 (49%)

PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL POPULATION = 15.8%

TABLE III

THE FINAL SAMPLE
(Subjects Interviewed)

SOUTH

<u>ADA</u>	<u>ELEMENTARY</u>	<u>HIGH SCHOOL</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
0-1,000	0 (0%)	1 (2%)	1 (2%)
1,000-19,999	15 (25%)	5 (8%)	20 (33%)
20,000-29,999	9 (15%)	0 (0%)	9 (15%)
30,000+	<u>2 (3%)</u>	<u>0 (0%)</u>	<u>2 (3%)</u>
Total	26 (43%)	6 (10%)	32 (52%)

NORTH

0-1,000	4 (7%)	1 (2%)	5 (8%)
1,000-19,999	15 (25%)	3 (5%)	18 (30%)
20,000-29,999	0 (0%)	6 (10%)	6 (10%)
30,000+	<u>0 (0%)</u>	<u>0 (0%)</u>	<u>0 (0%)</u>
Total	19 (31%)	10 (16%)	29 (48%)

PERCENTAGE OF THOSE CONTACTED = 75.3%

PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL SAMPLE = 13.4%

PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL SAMPLE (Test population included) = 14%

TABLE IV

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SUBJECTS

A. Caseload

The prescribed maximum caseload for Resource Specialists is 28. This limit is not supposed to be exceeded without a waiver from the State Board. The caseload of the subjects of the study was:

Total

Elementary - Range = 11 to 39

Mean = 26.82

Standard deviation = 4.2

N = 45

High School - Range = 18 to 30 [One subject was half-time with a load of 14.]

Mean = 27.466

Standard deviation = 1.2

N = 15 full-time.

By Geographical Region and ADA

SOUTH -

Elementary -	<u>ADA</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Range</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>
	0-999	0	0	0	0
	1,000-29,999	24	17 to 28	26	3.1
	30,000+	2	21 to 24	23	2.0
High School -					
	0-999	1	28	28	0
	1,000-19,999	4*	18-28	26	5.0
	30,000+	0	0	0	0

NORTH

Elementary -	<u>ADA</u>		<u>Range</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>
	0-999	4	11-32	25	8.1
	1,000-19,999	15	21-39	28	2.7
	30,000+	0	0	0	0
High School -					
	0-999	1	28	28	0
	1,000-19,999	9	27-30	28	.7
	30,000+	0	0	0	0

60*

*One Resource Specialist was half-time with a load of 14.

B. Resource Specialist's Projected Completion Date

For the subjects of the study:

Completed in 1982 = 18

Will complete in 1983 = 34

Total to complete by 1983 = 52 (85.2%)

Will complete in 1984 = 3

Total to complete by 1984 = 55 (90.2%)

Will complete in 1985 = 2

Total to complete by 1985 = 57 (93.4%)

Do not plan to complete = 4 (7%)*

* Reasons: 3 plan to retire and one refuses to take CBEST and will go back to classroom teaching.

Breakdown by District ADA

	<u>0-999</u>	<u>1,000-19,999</u>	<u>20,000+</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>SOUTH</u>				
<u>Elementary</u>				
1982	0	3(5%)	4(7%)	7(12%)
1983	0	8(13%)	6(10%)	14(23%)
1984	0	2(3%)	0	2(3%)
1985	0	0	1(2%)	1(2%)
No	0	2(3%)	0	2(3%)
Total	0	15(24%)	11(18%)	26(43%)
<u>High School</u>				
1982	0	0	0	0
1983	1(2%)	4(7%)	0	5(8%)
1984	0	0	0	0
1985	0	1(2%)	0	1(2%)
No	0	0	0	0
Total	1(2%)	5(9%)	0	6(10%)

NORTH

Elementary

1982	2 (3%)	5 (8%)	0	7 (11%)
1983	2 (3%)	9 (15%)	0	11 (18%)
1984	0	0	0	0
1985	0	0	0	0
No	0	1 (2%)	0	1 (2%)
Total	4 (7%)	15 (24%)	0	19 (31%)

High School

1982	0	2 (3%)	2 (3%)	4 (7%)
1983	1 (2%)	0	3 (5%)	4 (7%)
1984	0	0	1 (2%)	1 (2%)
1985	0	0	0	0
No	0	1 (2%)	0	1 (2%)
Total	1 (2%)	3 (5%)	6 (10%)	10 (16%)

C. Application source for subjects

From within the district = 37

	<u>South</u>	<u>North</u>
Elementary	17	9
High School	4	7
Total	21	16

From outside the district = 24

	<u>South</u>	<u>North</u>
Elementary	9	10
High School	2	3
Total	11	13

Breakdown by District ADA

<u>SOUTH</u>	<u>0-999</u>	<u>1,000-19,999</u>	<u>20,000+</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Elementary</u>				
Within	0	8 (13%)	9 (15%)	17 (28%)
Outside	0	7 (11%)	2 (3%)	9 (15%)
Total	0	15 (25%)	11 (18%)	26 (43%)

<u>High School</u>				
Within	0	4 (7%)	0	4 (7%)
Outside	1 (2%)	1 (2%)	0	2 (3%)
Total	1 (2%)	5 (8%)	0	6 (10%)

NORTH

<u>Elementary</u>				
Within	1 (2%)	8 (13%)	0	9 (15%)
Outside	3 (5%)	7 (11%)	0	10 (16%)
Total	4 (7%)	15 (25%)	0	19 (31%)

<u>High School</u>				
Within	1 (2%)	1 (2%)	5 (8%)	7 (11%)
Outside	0	2 (3%)	1 (2%)	3 (5%)
Total	1 (2%)	3 (5%)	6 (10%)	10 (16%)

D. Reasons for waiver

	<u>Applied from within</u>		<u>Applied from outside</u>	
	<u>Elem.</u>	<u>High School</u>	<u>Elem.</u>	<u>High School</u>
Lacked three years of experience	6	1	6	3
Lacked clear credential	19	9	12	1
Lacked experience in both regular and special education	1	0	1	1
Lacked other Resource Specialist courses	0	1	0	0
Total	26	11	19	5

SOUTH

ADA	<u>Lacked 3 years</u>	<u>Lacked clear</u>	<u>Lacked experience</u>	<u>Other</u>
	<u>Experience</u>	<u>Credential</u>	<u>in both</u>	
Elementary				
1,000-19,999	3	12	0	0
20,000+	4	7	0	0
High School				
0-999	1	0	0	0
1,000-19,999	2	3	0	0

NORTH

Elementary				
0-999	2	1	1	0
1,000-19,999	3	11	1	0
High School				
0-999	0	1	0	0
1,000-19,999	0	2	1	0
20,000+	1	4	0	1
Total	16	41	3	1

Breakdown by District ADA

SOUTH

	<u>0-999</u>	<u>1,000-19,999</u>	<u>20,000+</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Elementary</u>				
Lacked 3 years of experience	0	3 (5%)	4 (7%)	7 (11%)
Lacked clear credential	0	12 (20%)	7 (11%)	19 (31%)
Lacked experience in both [Regular & Special Education teaching]	0	0	0	0
Total	0	15 (25%)	11 (18%)	26 (43%)

High School

Lacked 3 years of experience	1 (2%)	2 (3%)	0	3 (5%)
Lacked clear credential	0	3 (5%)	0	3 (5%)
Lacked experience in both	0	0	0	0
Total	1 (2%)	5 (8%)	0	6 (10%)

NORTH

Elementary

Lacked 3 years of experience	2 (3%)	3 (5%)	0	5 (8%)
Lacked clear credential	1 (2%)	11 (18%)	0	12 (20%)
Lacked experience in both	1 (2%)	1 (2%)	0	2 (3%)
Total	4 (7%)	15 (25%)	0	19 (31%)

<u>High School</u>	<u>0-999</u>	<u>1,000-19,999</u>	<u>20,000+</u>	<u>Total</u>
Lacked 3 years of experience	0	0	1 (2%)	1 (2%)
Lacked clear credential	1 (2%)	2 (3%)	4 (7%)	7 (11%)
Lacked experience in both	0	1 (2%)	0	1 (2%)
Other- Resource specialist training	0	0	1 (2%)	1 (2%)
Total	1 (2%)	3 (5%)	6 (10%)	10 (16%)

E. Completion date by waiver need:

	<u>Hired from Within</u>				<u>Hired from Outside</u>		
	<u>1982</u>	<u>'83</u>	<u>'84</u>	<u>'85</u>	<u>1982</u>	<u>'83</u>	<u>'84</u>
Lacked clear credential	6	17	2	0	6	6	1
Lacked 3 years experience	2	3	0	2	2	7	0
Lacked experience in both Regular & special education	1	0	0	0	1	1	0
Total	9	20	2	2	9	14	1

[Four who lacked a clear credential do not plan to complete the requirements and one who lacked "other requirements" completed in 1983]

F. Distance from University or State College Offering Program:

<u>Lacked clear credential</u>	<u>Hired from within</u>		<u>Hired from Outside</u>	
	<u>Elem.</u>	<u>High School</u>	<u>Elem.</u>	<u>High School</u>
Under 25 miles	11	7	7	1
Between 25 & 50 miles	2	0	2	0
Between 50 & 75 miles	2	1	1	0
Over 75 miles	4	1	2	0
Total	19	9	12	1

TABLE V

SELF REPORT OF RESOURCE SPECIALISTS

A. What do you consider the strong points you have brought to your role as a Resource Specialist? [First choice answer]

	<u>Elementary</u>	<u>High School</u>	<u>Total</u>
Organized	7 (11%)	2 (3%)	9 (14%)
Experienced	16 (26%)	4 (7%)	20 (33%)
Relate well to children	20 (33%)	9 (15%)	29 (48%)
Relate well to teachers/parents	2 (3%)	0	2 (3%)
Career ed. experience	0	1 (2%)	1 (2%)
	45 (74%)	16 (26%)	61 (100%)

Breakdown by District's ADA

	<u>ADA</u>			
	<u>0-999</u>	<u>1,000-19,999</u>	<u>20,000+</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>High School</u>				
Organized	0	2 (13%)	0	2 (13%)
Experienced	0	3 (19%)	1 (6%)	4 (25%)
Relate well to children	2 (13%)	2 (12%)	5 (31%)	9 (56%)
Relate well to teachers	0	0	0	0
Career education experience	0	1 (6%)	0	1 (6%)
Total	2 (13%)	8 (50%)	6 (37%)	16 (100%)

Elementary

Organized	2 (4%)	2 (4%)	3 (7%)	7 (16%)
Experienced	0	15 (33%)	1 (2%)	16 (35%)
Relate well to children	0	16 (36%)	4 (9%)	20 (45%)
Relate well to teachers	0	1 (2%)	1 (2%)	2 (4%)
Total	2 (4%)	34 (75%)	9 (20%)	45 (100%)

B. What do you consider your weakest point in your role as a
Resource Specialist? [First choice answer]

	<u>Elementary</u>	<u>High School</u>	<u>Total</u>
Not enough time	10 (16%)	8 (13%)	18 (30%)
Too many children	2 (3%)	1 (2%)	3 (5%)
Too many types to deal with	5 (8%)	1 (2%)	6 (10%)
Lack teacher cooperation	1 (2%)	0	1 (2%)
Paperwork	8 (13%)	2 (3%)	10 (16%)
Not enough time with teachers	1 (2%)	0	1 (2%)
Need time for assessment	1 (2%)	0	1 (2%)
Too little aide time	2 (3%)	0	2 (3%)
Lack of attendance	0	2 (3%)	2 (3%)
No parent support	2 (3%)	0	2 (3%)
Not enough time for parents	1 (2%)	0	1 (2%)
So many responsibilities	0	1 (2%)	1 (2%)
Small space to work in	1 (2%)	0	1 (2%)
Organizational skills	2 (3%)	0	2 (3%)
Need more expert help	3 (5%)	0	3 (5%)
Need new ideas constantly	1 (2%)	0	1 (2%)
Only employed half-time	0	1 (2%)	1 (2%)
Not enough feed-back	1 (2%)	0	1 (2%)
Regular teacher inservice	1 (2%)	0	1 (2%)
None	3 (5%)	0	3 (5%)
Total	45 (74%)	16 (26%)	61 (100%)

C. What preparation or type of person does it take to be a good
Resource Specialist in your district? [First choice answer]

	<u>Elementary</u>	<u>High School</u>	<u>Total</u>
Regular class experience	19 (31%)	8 (13%)	27 (44%)
Special class experience	0	0	0
Motivated	4 (7%)	3 (5%)	7 (11%)
Patient	7 (11%)	1 (2%)	8 (13%)
Teaching skills	6 (10%)	0	6 (10%)
Flexible	4 (7%)	0	4 (7%)
Knowledge of special ed.	1 (2%)	0	1 (2%)
Skills for working with parents	1 (2%)	0	1 (2%)
Time management skills	0	1 (2%)	1 (2%)
Internship	0	1 (2%)	1 (2%)
Communication skills	1 (2%)	0	1 (2%)
Behavior modification skills	1 (2%)	0	1 (2%)
Adaptable	1 (2%)	1 (2%)	2 (3%)
"A caring person"	0	1 (2%)	1 (2%)
Total	45 (74%)	16 (26%)	61 (100%)

Second Choice Answer

	<u>Elementary</u>	<u>High School</u>	<u>Total</u>
Regular class experience	6 (10%)	1 (2%)	7 (12%)
Special class experience	5 (8%)	4 (6%)	9 (14%)
Motivated	3 (5%)	0	3 (5%)
Patience	8 (13%)	3 (5%)	11 (18%)
Teaching skills	8 (13%)	1 (2%)	9 (15%)
Adaptable	2 (4%)	0	2 (4%)
Organized	4 (6%)	0	4 (6%)
Patient with colleagues	1 (2%)	1 (2%)	2 (3%)
Vocation education skills	0	1 (2%)	1 (2%)
"People skills"	7 (11%)	4 (6%)	11 (17%)
Assessment techniques	1 (2%)	1 (2%)	2 (4%)
Total	45 (74%)	16 (26%)	61 (100%)

TABLE VI
REPORT OF THE PRINCIPALS

A. What would you consider the strong points the subject has displayed as a Resource Specialist? [First choice answer]

	<u>Elementary</u>	<u>High School</u>	<u>Total</u>
Intense interest in children.	32 (52%)	7 (11%)	39 (64%)
Ability to get along with teachers	1 (2%)	2 (3%)	3 (5%)
Enthusiasm	1 (2%)	2 (3%)	3 (5%)
Training and techniques	2 (3%)	2 (3%)	4 (7%)
Organization skills	3 (5%)	2 (3%)	5 (8%)
"Personal touch"	0	1 (2%)	1 (2%)
"Gets along with parents"	1 (2%)	0	1 (2%)
"Empathy towards students"	1 (2%)	0	1 (2%)
"Outstanding teacher"	1 (2%)	0	1 (2%)
"Consistency"	1 (2%)	0	1 (2%)
"Serves above and beyond"	1 (2%)	0	1 (2%)
"Believes any child can succeed"	1 (2%)	0	1 (2%)
Total	45 (74%)	16 (25%)	61 (100%)

Breakdown by District's ADA

	<u>ADA</u>			<u>Total</u>
	<u>0-999</u>	<u>1,000-19,999</u>	<u>20,000+</u>	
<u>High School</u>				
Intense Interest in children.	1 (6%)	4 (25%)	2 (13%)	7 (44%)
Ability to get along with teachers.	0	2 (13%)	0	2 (13%)
Enthusiasm.	0	1 (6%)	1 (6%)	2 (13%)
Training and techniques.	1 (6%)	1 (6%)	0	2 (13%)
Organization skills	0	0	2 (13%)	2 (13%)
Other.*	0	0	1 (6%)	1 (6%)
Total	2 (13%)	8 (50%)	6 (37%)	16 (100%)

* "Personal touch"

	ADA			
	<u>0-999</u>	<u>1,000-19,999</u>	<u>20,000+</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Elementary</u>				
Intense interest in children.	1 (2%)	25 (55%)	6 (13%)	32 (71%)
Ability to get along with teachers.	1 (2%)	0	0	1 (2%)
Enthusiasm.	0	0	1 (2%)	1 (2%)
Training and techniques.	0	2 (2%)	0	2 (4%)
Organization skills.	1 (2%)	0	2 (4%)	3 (5%)
Other*	1 (2%)	3 (7%)	2 (4%)	6 (13%)
Total	4 (9%)	30 (67%)	11 (24%)	45 (100%)

* 0-999 -- "Gets along with parents."

1,000-19,999 - "Empathy towards students."

"Outstanding teacher."

"Consistency."

20,000+ - "Serves above and beyond."

"Believes any child can succeed."

B. What would you consider the weakest point in the subject's
Resource Specialist role? [First choice answer]

	<u>Elementary</u>	<u>High School</u>	<u>Total</u>
None	31 (51%)	12 (20%)	43 (70%)
Ability to get along with teachers.	0	1 (2%)	1 (2%)
Training and Techniques	2 (3%)	0	2 (3%)
"Tries to do too much."	7 (11%)	3 (5%)	10 (16%)
Inexperience	1 (2%)	0	1 (2%)
"Not as warm as could be."	1 (2%)	0	1 (2%)
"Speaks too softly."	1 (2%)	0	1 (2%)
"Over-committed to get training."	1 (2%)	0	1 (2%)
"Beginning to burn-out."	1 (2%)	0	1 (2%)
Total	45 (74%)	16 (26%)	61 (100%)

Breakdown by District's ADA

	<u>ADA</u>			<u>Total</u>
	<u>0-999</u>	<u>1,000-19,999</u>	<u>20,000+</u>	
<u>High School</u>				
Ability to get along with teachers.	0	1 (6%)	0	1 (6%)
None	2 (13%)	6 (38%)	4 (25%)	12 (75%)
"Tries to do too much."	0	1 (6%)	2 (13%)	3 (19%)
Total	2 (13%)	8 (50%)	6 (38%)	16 (100%)
<u>Elementary</u>				
Training & techniques	0	2 (4%)	0	2 (4%)
None	1 (2%)	24 (53%)	6 (13%)	31 (69%)
Other*	3 (7%)	4 (8%)	5 (11%)	12 (26%)
Total	4 (9%)	30 (67%)	11 (24%)	45 (100%)

C. What suggestions would you have regarding what preparation or type of person it takes to be a good Resource Specialist in this district? [First choice answer]

	<u>Elementary</u>	<u>High School</u>	<u>Total</u>
Taught regular class	12 (20%)	4 (7%)	16 (26%)
Taught special class	1 (2%)	0	1 (2%)
Organized	2 (3%)	2 (3%)	4 (7%)
Gets along with colleagues well.	4 (7%)	1 (2%)	5 (8%)
Gets along with children well.	15 (25%)	4 (7%)	19 (31%)
Has special skills.	7 (11%)	4 (7%)	11 (18%)
Patient	2 (3%)	1 (2%)	3 (5%)
"Knows how to teach."	1 (2%)	0	1 (2%)
Internship	1 (2%)	0	1 (2%)
Total	45 (74%)	16 (26%)	61 (100%)

Breakdown by District's ADA

	<u>ADA</u>			<u>Total</u>
	<u>0-999</u>	<u>1,000-19,999</u>	<u>20,000+</u>	
<u>High School</u>				
Taught regular class	0	2 (3%)	2 (3%)	4 (7%)
Organized	1 (2%)	1 (2%)	0	2 (3%)
Gets along well with colleagues.	0	1 (2%)	0	1 (2%)
Gets along well with children.	0	2 (3%)	2 (3%)	4 (7%)
Has special skills.	0	2 (3%)	2 (3%)	4 (7%)
"Patient"	1 (2%)	0	0	1 (2%)
Total	2 (3%)	8 (13%)	6 (10%)	16 (26%)

	<u>0-999</u>	<u>1,000-19,999</u>	<u>20,000+</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Elementary</u>				
Taught regular class	1 (2%)	4 (7%)	7 (11%)	12 (20%)
Taught special class	0	1 (2%)	0	1 (2%)
Organized	1 (2%)	1 (2%)	0	2 (3%)
Gets along well with colleagues.	1 (2%)	1 (2%)	2 (3%)	4 (7%)
Gets along well with children.	1 (2%)	13 (21%)	1 (2%)	15 (25%)
Has special skills.	0	6 (10%)	1 (2%)	7 (11%)
"Patient"	0	2 (3%)	0	2 (3%)
"Knows how to teach."	0	1 (2%)	0	1 (2%)
Internship	0	1 (2%)	0	1 (2%)
Total	4 (7%)	30 (49%)	11 (18%)	45 (74%)

TABLE VII

REPORT OF THE COLLEAGUE TEACHERS

A. How would you say the subject waived resource specialist has worked out in his/her role as resource specialist?

	ADA			
	<u>0-999</u>	<u>1,000-19,999</u>	<u>20,000+</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>High School</u>				
"Very well"	6 (12%)	21 (44%)	14 (30%)	41 (85%)
"Good"	0	3 (6%)	4 (8%)	7 (15%)
"Could be better"	0	0	0	0
"Poor"	0	0	0	0
Total	6 (12%)	24 (50%)	18 (38%)	48 (100%)
<u>Elementary</u>				
"Very Well"	8 (6%)	85 (63%)	31 (23%)	124 (92%)
"Good"	4 (3%)	3 (2%)	2 (2%)	9 (7%)
"Could be better"	0	2 (1%)	0	2 (1%)
"Poor"	0	0	0	0
Total	12 (9%)	90 (67%)	33 (24%)	135 (100%)

B. How has the subject worked with you with special education children?

	ADA			
	<u>0-999</u>	<u>1,000-19,999</u>	<u>20,000+</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>High School</u>				
"She/he has given limited help."	0	2 (4%)	3 (6%)	5 (10%)
"We have worked closely."	6 (13%)	22 (46%)	15 (31%)	43 (90%)
Total	6 (13%)	24 (50%)	18 (37%)	48 (100%)
<u>Elementary</u>				
"Didn't feel he/she was qualified."	0	1	0	1
"She/he has given limited help."	0	3 (2%)	5 (4%)	8 (6%)
"We have worked closely."	12 (9%)	86 (64%)	28 (21%)	126 (93%)
Total	12 (9%)	90 (67%)	33 (24%)	135 (100%)

C. In what ways could the subject have assisted you, but was unable to?

ADA

	<u>0-999</u>	<u>1,000-19,999</u>	<u>20,000+</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>High School</u>				
More time for communication/ consultation.	0	3 (6%)	6 (13%)	9 (19%)
Taken children out longer.	0	1 (2%)	0	1 (2%)
Worked more in my classroom.	0	0	0	0
None	6 (13%)	20 (42%)	12 (25%)	38 (79%)
Total	6 (13%)	24 (50%)	18 (38%)	48 (100%)
<u>Elementary</u>				
More time for communication/ consultation.	5 (4%)	42 (31%)	4 (3%)	51 (38%)
Taken children out longer.	0	2 (1%)	1 (1%)	3 (2%)
Worked more in my classroom.	0	1 (1%)	1 (1%)	2 (2%)
None	7 (5%)	45 (33%)	27 (20%)	79 (59%)
Total	12 (9%)	90 (67%)	33 (24%)	135 (100%)

D. Do you have any suggestions about how the resource specialist's
role could be changed to assist the regular classroom teacher more?

ADA

	<u>0-999</u>	<u>1,000-19,999</u>	<u>20,000+</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>High School</u>				
Less paperwork.	0	2(4%)	3(6%)	5(10%)
More time to discuss children and problems.	1(2%)	8(17%)	8(17%)	17(35%)
More time working in the classroom, rather than pull-out.	1(2%)	1(2%)	1(2%)	3(6%)
More pull-out, less working in classroom.	0	0	0	0
No	4(8%)	13(27%)	6(13)	23(48%)
Total	6(12)	24(50%)	18(38%)	48(100%)
<u>Elementary</u>				
Less paperwork.	2(1%)	17(13%)	2(1%)	21(15%)
More time to discuss children and problems.	1(1%)	21(15%)	9(7%)	31(23%)
More time working in the classroom, rather than pull-out.	1(1%)	0	1(1%)	2(1%)
More pull-out, less working in classroom.	0	1(1%)	1(1%)	2(1%)
No	8(6%)	51(38%)	20(15%)	79(59%)
Total	12(9%)	90(67%)	33(24%)	135(100%)

E. If you were in charge of designing the requirements for persons to
qualify as resource specialist, what requirements would you specify?
(First choice answer)

	ADA			
	<u>0-999</u>	<u>1,000-19,999</u>	<u>20,000+</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>High School</u>				
Taught regular classes.	1 (2%)	2 (4%)	6 (13%)	9 (19%)
Taught special classes.	0	0	0	0
Graduate work (M.A.).	0	0	0	0
Organization skills.	0	2 (4%)	1 (2%)	3 (6%)
"Good at getting along with colleagues."	0	5 (10%)	3 (6%)	8 (17%)
"Good at getting along with children."	4 (8%)	11 (23%)	8 (17%)	23 (48%)
Special teaching skills	1 (2%)	4 (8%)	0	5 (10%)
	6 (12%)	24 (50%)	18 (38%)	48 (100%)
Total				

Elementary

Taught regular classes.	4 (3%)	20 (15%)	5 (4%)	29 (22%)
Taught special classes.	0	1 (1%)	1 (1%)	2 (1%)
Graduate work (M.A.).	0	0	0	0
Organization skills.	2 (1%)	7 (5%)	2 (1%)	11 (8%)
"Good at getting along with colleagues."	1 (1%)	16 (12%)	4 (3%)	21 (16%)
"Good at getting along with children."	5 (4%)	32 (24%)	18 (13%)	55 (41%)
Special teaching skills.	0	14 (10%)	3 (2%)	17 (12%)
Total	12 (9%)	90 (67%)	33 (24%)	135 (100%)

TABLE VIII

A. Comparison of highest priority staff development perceived needs.

<u>Stated Preference</u>	<u>Waivered Resource Specialists</u>	<u>Non-Waivered</u>
<u>Elementary</u>		
Sharing of materials	1	1
Time management	2	2
Assessment	3	2
Career Education		1
Remediation techniques	2	2
Inter-staff relationship building [Developing rapport with regular teachers]	1	1
Bilingual techniques	1	1
Teaching strategies	1	1
Total	11	11
<u>High School</u>		
Student integration	1	1
Vocational education	1	1
Teaching strategies	4	3
New laws affecting our jobs		1
A look at exemplary programs	1	1
Assessment techniques	1	1
Differential proficiency standards	1	1
Total	9	9

Elementary ____

Secondary ____

Case Load ____

WAIVERED RESOURCE SPECIALIST'S INTERVIEW

Introduction

You received a waiver during the last school year from the State Board of Education in order to serve as a resource specialist. I am here as part of a Research Project to interview the principal; you; several of the teachers with whom you work; and other resource specialists.

The purpose of the interviews is to determine, for this sample, if the resource specialists who received the State Board waivers serve satisfactorily in their positions.

All persons interviewed will remain anonymous and no part of the study is designed to evaluate anyone, but to collect data on the total sample.

QUESTION 1 Can you describe for me the resource specialist program here in this district?

Possible Answers:

1. Basically, an LDG type program.
2. Some modification, but basically the Resource Specialist has the children all day.
3. The description in the law:
 - (1) Pupil assigned to regular classroom for the majority of the school day.
 - (2) Provision of information and assistance to the individual with exceptional needs and their parents.
 - (3) Provision of consultation, resource information, and material regarding the individual with exceptional needs to their parents and to regular staff members.
 - (4) Coordination of special education services with the regular school program for each individual with exceptional needs in the resource specialist program.
 - (5) Monitoring of pupil progress on a regular basis, participation in the review and revision of the I.E.P.s as appropriate, and referral of pupils who do not demonstrate appropriate progress to the I.E.P. Team
 - (6) Secondary level - emphasis on academic achievement, career and vocational development, and preparation for adult life.

QUESTION 2 Why did the district request a waiver for you?

Possible Answers:

- ☐ Lacked three years experience.
- ☐ Lacked clear special education credential.
- ☐ Lacked experience in both special and regular education.
- ☐ Other:

QUESTION 3 How were you chosen to be a resource specialist?

Possible Answers:

- ☐ Applied from within district.
- ☐ Applied from outside district.
- ☐ Appointed without application
- ☐ Other:

QUESTION 4 Was this the first State Board waiver for you?

YES ☐ NO ☐ How many before 1981-82 ☐

QUESTION 5 Have you had an opportunity to attend staff development sessions here in the district?

YES ☐ What kind?

NO ☐ Why not?

QUESTION 6 Are you attending staff development or college sessions outside the district?

YES ☐ Where?

NO ☐

QUESTION 7 How far away is the closest program being offered?

Under 25 miles ☐ Over 25 miles ☐

Over 50 miles? ☐ Over 75 miles? ☐

QUESTION 8 What would you consider the strong points you have brought to your role as a resource specialist?

Possible Answers:

- ☐ Organized.
- ☐ Motivated
- ☐ Experienced
- ☐ Relate well to children
- ☐ Relate well to teachers
- ☐ Other:

QUESTION 9 What would you consider your weakest point in your role as a resource specialist?

Possible Answers:

- ☐ Not enough time.
- ☐ Too many children.
- ☐ Too many different types to deal with.
- ☐ Lack teacher cooperation.
- ☐ Other:

QUESTION 10 Have you met the full requirements for the Resource Specialist's Preliminary Credential? Full requirements for the Resource Specialist's Certificate of Competence?

YES ☐ NO ☐ When do you anticipate you will ?

Preliminary _____ Full _____

QUESTION 11 Does the district plan to apply for another waiver this year for you?

YES ☐ NO ☐

QUESTION 12 Do you have any suggestions regarding what preparation or type of person it takes to be a good resource specialist in your district?

Possible Answers:

☐ Regular class experience

☐ Special class experience

☐ Motivated

☐ Patience

☐ Teaching skills

☐ Other:

QUESTION 13 In your role as a resource specialist, what do you consider the highest priority for your own staff development or inservice needs?

1.

2.

PRINCIPAL INTERVIEW

Introduction

_____ received a waiver during the last school year from the State Board of Education in order to serve as a resource specialist. I am here as part of Research Project to interview you; the resource specialist who received the waiver; two or three of the teachers with whom the resource specialist works; and other resource specialists.

The purpose of the interviews is to determine, for this sample, if the resource specialists who received the State Board waivers serve satisfactorily in their positions.

All persons interviewed will remain anonymous and no part of the study is designed to evaluate anyone, but to collect data on the total sample.

QUESTION 1 Can you describe for me the resource specialist program here in this district?

Possible Answers:

1. Basically, an LDG type program.
2. Some modification, but basically the Resource Specialist has the children all day.
3. The description in the law:
 - (1) Pupil assigned to regular classroom for the majority of the school day.
 - (2) Provision of information and assistance to the individual with exceptional needs and their parents.
 - (3) Provision of consultation, resource information, and material regarding the individual with exceptional needs to their parents and to regular staff members.
 - (4) Coordination of special education services with the regular school program for each individual with exceptional needs in the resource specialist program.
 - (5) Monitoring of pupil progress on a regular basis, participation in the review and revision of the I.E.P.s as appropriate, and referral of pupils who do not demonstrate appropriate progress to the I.E.P. Team.
 - (6) Secondary level - emphasis on academic achievement, career and vocational development, and preparation for adult life.

QUESTION 2 How was _____ chosen for the position of resource specialist?

Possible Answers:

- ☐ Applied from within district.
- ☐ Applied from outside district.
- ☐ Appointed without application.
- ☐ Other:

QUESTION 3 Was this the first State Board waiver for this resource specialist?

YES ☐ NO ☐ How many before 1981-82 ☐ Don't know ☐

QUESTION 4 Has the _____ had an opportunity to attend staff development sessions here in the district?

YES ☐ What kind ?

NO ☐ Why not ?

QUESTION 5 Is _____ attending staff development or college sessions outside the district?

YES ☐ Where ?

NO ☐

QUESTION 6 How far away is the closest program being offered ?

Under 25 miles ☐ Over 25 miles ☐

Over 50 miles ☐ Over 75 miles ☐

QUESTION 7 What would you consider the strong points _____
has displayed as a resource specialist?

Possible Answers:

- ___ Intense interest in children.
- ___ Ability to get along with teachers.
- ___ Enthusiasm.
- ___ Training & techniques.
- ___ Organization skills.
- ___ Other:

QUESTION 8 What would you consider her/his weakest point in her/his
role as a resource specialist?

- ___ Motivation
- ___ Ability to get along with teachers.
- ___ Enthusiasm
- ___ Training & techniques
- ___ Organization skills.
- ___ Other:

QUESTION 9 Do you plan to apply for another waiver this year for
her/him?

YES ___ NO ___

QUESTION 10 Has _____ met the full requirements for the Resource Specialist's Preliminary Credential? Full requirements for the Resource Specialist's Certificate of Competence?

YES ___ NO ___ When do you anticipate he/she will ?

Preliminary _____ Full _____

QUESTION 11 Do you have any suggestions regarding what preparation or type of person it takes to be a good resource specialist in your district?

Possible Answers:

- ___ Taught regular classes
- ___ Taught special classes
- ___ At least an M.A.
- ___ Organized.
- ___ Good at getting along with colleagues.
- ___ Good at getting along with children.
- ___ Special skills, like behavior modification.
- ___ Other:

COLLEAGUE TEACHER'S INTERVIEW

Introduction

_____ received a waiver during the last school year from the State Board of Education in order to serve as a resource specialist. I am here as part of a Research Project to interview the principal; the resource specialist who received the waiver; two or three of you teachers with whom the resource specialist works; and other resource specialists.

The purpose of the interviews is to determine, for this sample, if the resource specialists who received the State Board waivers serve satisfactorily in their positions.

All persons interviewed will remain anonymous and no part of the study is designed to evaluate anyone, but to collect data on the total sample. No information from these interviews will be used in Stull Act evaluations!

QUESTION 1 Can you describe for me the resource specialist program here in this district?

Possible Answers:

1. Basically, an LDG type program.
2. Some modification, but basically the Resource Specialist has the children all day.
3. The description in the law:
 - (1) Pupil assigned to regular classroom for the majority of the school day.
 - (2) Provision of information and assistance to the individual with exceptional needs and their parents.
 - (3) Provision of consultation, resource information, and material regarding the individual with exceptional needs to their parents and to regular staff members.
 - (4) Coordination of special education services with the regular school program for each individual with exceptional needs in the resource specialist program.
 - (5) Monitoring of pupil progress on a regular basis, participation in the review and revision of the I.E.P.s as appropriate, and referral of pupils who do not demonstrate appropriate progress to the I.E.P. Team.
 - (6) Secondary level - emphasis on academic achievement, career and vocational development, and preparation for adult life.

QUESTION 2 How would you say _____ has worked out in her/his role as resource specialist?

Possible Answers:

- ☐ Very well.
- ☐ Good.
- ☐ Could be better
- ☐ Poor
- ☐ Other:

QUESTION 3 How has _____ worked with you with special education children?

Possible answers:

- ☐ Has not, but has had self-contained classroom.
- ☐ Didn't want his/her help.
- ☐ Didn't feel he/she was qualified.
- ☐ She/he has given limited help.
- ☐ We have worked closely.

QUESTION 4 In what ways could _____ have assisted you, but was unable to?

Possible answers:

- ☐ More time for communication-consultation.
- ☐ Taken children out longer.
- ☐ Worked more in my classroom.
- ☐ Other:

QUESTION 5 Do you have suggestions about how the resource specialist role could be changed to assist the regular classroom teacher more?

Possible Answers:

- ☐ Less paperwork.
- ☐ More time to discuss children & problems.
- ☐ More time working in the classroom, rather than pull-out.
- ☐ More pull-out, less working in the classroom.
- ☐ Other:

QUESTION 6 If you were in charge of designing the requirements for persons to qualify as resource specialist, what requirements would you have?

Possible Answers:

- ☐ Taught regular classes.
- ☐ Taught special classes.
- ☐ At least an M.A.
- ☐ Organized.
- ☐ Good at getting along with colleagues.
- ☐ Good at getting along with children.
- ☐ Special skills, like behavior modification.
- ☐ Other:

NON-WAIVERED RESOURCE SPECIALIST'S INTERVIEW

Introduction

_____ received a waiver during the last school year from the State Board of Education in order to serve as a resource specialist. I am here as part of a Research Project to interview the principal; the resource specialist who received the waiver; two or three of the teachers with whom the resource specialist works and other resource specialists.

The purpose of the interviews is to determine, for this sample, if the resource specialists who received the State Board waivers serve satisfactorily in their positions.

All persons interviewed will remain anonymous and no part of the study is designed to evaluate anyone, but to collect data on the total sample.

QUESTION 1 Can you describe for me the resource specialist program here in this district?

Possible Answers:

1. Basically, an LDG type of program.
2. Some modification, but basically the Resource Specialist has the children all day.
3. The description in the law:
 - (1) Pupil assigned to regular classroom for the majority of the school day.
 - (2) Provision of information and assistance to the individual with exceptional needs and their parents.
 - (3) Provision of consultation, resource information, and material regarding the individual with exceptional needs to their parents and to regular staff members.
 - (4) Coordination of special education services with the regular school program for each individual with exceptional needs in the resource specialist program.
 - (5) Monitoring of pupil progress on a regular basis, participation in the review and revision of the I.E.P.s as appropriate, and referral of pupils who do not demonstrate appropriate progress to the I.E.P. Team.
 - (6) Secondary level - emphasis on academic achievement, career and vocational development, and preparation for adult life.

QUESTION 2 Is _____ attending staff development or college sessions outside the district?

YES _____ Where ?
NO _____

QUESTION 3 How far away is the closest program being offered ?

Under 25 miles? _____ Over 25 miles _____

Over 50 miles? _____ Over 75 miles? _____

QUESTION 4 In your role as a resource specialist, what do you consider the highest priority for your own staff development/in-service needs? Second highest?

1.

2.

QUESTION 5 Has _____ operated in a different mode from you in his/her role as a resource specialist?

YES:

NO:

NOT AWARE:

Question 6 Do you have any suggestions regarding what preparation or type of person it takes to be a good resource specialist in this district?

Possible Answers:

- ___ Regular class experience
- ___ Special class experience
- ___ Motivated
- ___ Patience
- ___ Teaching skills
- ___ Other: